



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,820	02/03/2004	Koichiro Tanaka	740756-2709	9528
22204	7590	01/31/2006		
NIXON PEABODY, LLP		EXAMINER		
401 9TH STREET, NW		HEINRICH, SAMUEL M		
SUITE 900		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128		1725		

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/769,820	TANAKA, KOICHIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Samuel M. Heinrich	1725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/170,739.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,086,635. Creaser et al show a work holder having a cylindrical shape curvature. The instant claimed intended use, as a laser irradiation stage, does not impart patentability to an apparatus claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,743,601 to Bonner et al. Bonner et al disclose a laser apparatus comprising means for expanding a laser beam and means for condensing a laser beam and means for moving a work holder. Bonner et al describe (Brief Summary BSTX 12) the well known use of a curved work holding surface. The use of a curved work holding surface in the apparatus disclosed by Bonner et al would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because laser

apparatus are well known and because a wide variety of work holders are well known for use with laser apparatus depending on the work which is intended to be irradiated with the laser. Cylindrical lens elements are well known in the laser art. Excimer, YAG, YVO₄, YLF, YAlO₃, and glass lasers are well known in arts such as laser annealing.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 8, 12, 15, and 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,614. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claim descriptions do not add any elements which significantly change the instant claimed apparatus from the previously claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 26, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to Creaser et al, applicant argues that the examiner has dismissed structural limitations. This argument is not convincing. Applicant has claimed a stage having a particular cylindrical shape curvature. Creaser et al disclose a work surface which comprises cylindrical shape curvature. With respect to Bonner et al, applicant argues that Bonner et al do not disclose a surface having "cylindrical shape curvature in the direction parallel to the first direction". This argument is not persuasive. Bonner et al disclose well known curved work holding surfaces (e.g., column 3, lines 38-47) and the use of a curved work holding surface with a laser beam oscillator would have been obvious depending on the work which is intended to be irradiated. With

respect to obvious-type double patenting, applicant remarks that the '614 Patent do not appear to recite the instant claimed features. This argument is not convincing. The instant claims do not add any elements to the claimed apparatus which significantly define them over the previously claimed invention.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel M. Heinrich whose telephone number is 571-272-1175. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, P. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Samuel M. Heinrich
Samuel M Heinrich
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1725

SMH